

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to for improper cross-hatching of the insulator and sealing members. Replacement sheets containing FIGS. 3-6 are attached hereto, wherein the cross-hatching of the insulator and sealing members has been modified to reflect proper cross-hatching of these components as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added by these drawing modifications.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,109,964 to Kooiman. Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kooiman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,154,636 to Vaccaro or alternatively U.S. Patent No. 6,133,532 to Lundback et al. Claims 1-3 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kooiman in view of applicant's admitted prior art FIG. 2. For at least the following reasons, applicant traverses these rejections.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference, and the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. (MPEP § 2131). Kooiman clearly does not meet this standard with respect to claims 1, 4 and 5, and the Examiner has therefore failed to meet the burden of setting forth a prima facie case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For example, applicant's claim 1 requires the signal input of the device to be configured for connection to a signal source connector and the signal output of the device to be configured for connection to a

transmission line connector. While the inner connector element (20) and corresponding open end of the front body member (30) of the Kooiman device appear to be configured for connection to some type of connector structure, the opposite ends of connector element (20) and front body member (30) are clearly not configured for connection to any type of connector structure, but are instead configured for connection to an inner conductor (12) and an annularly corrugated outer conductor (11) respectively of a coaxial cable (10). Lacking a teaching of all claim limitations, Kooiman cannot anticipate applicant's claims 1, 4 and 5, and the § 102(b) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Because the § 103(a) rejection of claims 6 and 7 rely on the improper § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 4 and 5, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 6 and 7 is likewise improper and should be withdrawn.


The § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3 and 23-27 is based on an improper combination, and should also be withdrawn. Specifically, the Examiner identifies applicant's FIG. 2 as "applicant's admitted prior art", although neither applicant's specification nor applicant's FIG. 2 contain any indication that FIG. 2 represents prior art. To the contrary, the description of applicant's FIG. 2 at p. 3, lines 6-9 identifies FIG. 2 as being "a diagrammatic illustration of a communication signal receiving arrangement similar to that of FIG. 1 *implementing a device for connecting and sealing between the signal receiving antenna connector and the coaxial transmission line connector, in accordance with the present invention*" (emphasis added). Moreover, at p. 4, lines 11-14, applicant's disclosure describes FIG. 2 as illustrating "a communications signal receiving arrangement 10' *similar to arrangement 10 shown in FIG. 1, implementing a device 100* for connecting and sealing between an electrical connector of antenna 14

and transmission line connector 16, *in accordance with the present invention*" (emphasis added). FIGS. 3-6, in turn, illustrate various embodiments of the device 100, the details of which are further described in applicant's specification.

FIG. 2 thus does not represent admitted prior art, but instead illustrates applicant's connecting and sealing device, or fluid blocking device, 100 implemented in a conventional communication signal receiving arrangement 10'. Accordingly, the combination of Kooiman and applicant's FIG. 2 is improper, and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3 and 23-27 should be withdrawn.

Applicant has modified FIGS. 3-6 as suggested, and has traversed all claim rejections. Claims 1-7 and 23-27 are accordingly believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is solicited. The Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss any unresolved matters.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey A. Michael
Registration No. 37,394
Barnes & Thornburg
11 South Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-3335
Telephone: (317) 231-7382
Fax: (317) 231-7433

Attachments